



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

TWENTY-FOURTH YEAR

1470th MEETING: 29 MARCH 1969

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1470)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113)	1
The situation in the Middle East:	
Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

FOURTEEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH MEETING

Held in New York on Saturday, 29 March 1969, at 12 noon

President: Mr. Károly CSATORDAY (Hungary).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Algeria, China, Colombia, Finland, France, Hungary, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Senegal, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Zambia.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1470)

1. Adoption of the agenda.

2. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113).

3. The situation in the Middle East:

Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114).

1. The PRESIDENT: We have had a slight delay in starting this morning's meeting because very intensive consultations are going on, and they are still continuing at this very moment. I beg the understanding of members of the Council for the delay.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 26 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Jordan addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9113)

The situation in the Middle East

Letter dated 27 March 1969 from the Permanent Representative of Israel addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/9114)

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions previously taken by the Council, I propose now, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of Jordan, Israel and Saudi Arabia to take seats at the Council table in order to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. M. El-Farra (Jordan) Mr. Y. Tekoah (Israel) and Mr. J. M. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan.

4. Mr. El-FARRA (Jordan): We have listened with great attention to the statements delivered around this table and, while we find a measure of consolation in the unanimous condemnation of the savage Israeli attack against our people and civilian targets, we regret the apparent tendency on the part of some members to find justification for this act of international banditry. We are sorry that a few delegations have preoccupied themselves not with the substance of the question before the Council, but with side issues maliciously injected into our deliberations by Mr. Tekoah with the intention of perpetuating present cease-fire arrangements—which are, of course, temporary in nature—and to undermine the effects of the efforts of the Big Four.

5. The complaint of Jordan presents specific crimes committed against innocent civilian citizens of Jordan and civilian targets. The allegations of Mr. Tekoah about incidents committed within the occupied territories can only be considered together with the oppressive measures taken by the Israelis against the people. What I want to emphasize is that these Israeli acts of repression and the reaction of the people under occupation should be considered as a separate item, especially since the question was inscribed as a separate item and under a separate heading. I should like to emphasize this because, as I said earlier, occupation brings oppression and oppression leads to resistance. After all, what do we expect the people to do when The Hague Conventions of 1899 and of 1907, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Geneva Conventions of 1949 are violated every single day by the Israelis? What should be the action of the people when the prisoners are tortured and coerced and citizens are deprived of their property?

6. Only two days ago—and this is reported in *The New York Times* of today—a thirty-year-old Jordanian citizen, Kassem Tamimi, met his death while in prison suspected—I repeat suspected—of sabotage. Hundreds of mourners were stopped by the Israeli police the day before yesterday and a mounted water cannon was turned on them; and later they were beaten by the police and several were injured; four women were arrested. Our people believe that the suspect was beaten to death in prison. Notables led by Anwar Nusseibeh, former Jordanian Defence Minister, and Ambassador to Great Britain, demanded an autopsy con-

ducted by neutral examiners. This request was refused by the Israeli authorities. It was also revealed that four victims of the Israeli attack on Ein Hazar were truck drivers who were residents of the West Bank. They will be buried in their cities of Nablus, Ramallah and Bethlehem, possibly today. They had not been buried yesterday.

7. What should be the reaction of the people under occupation when the wounded and the sick, the infirm and pregnant women are given no protection; when hospitals are converted into offices for the *Gauleiters* of Israel who supervise these crimes and endorse their continuation? The confiscation of the newly built Jordanian Government hospital in Jerusalem's Sheikh Jarrah Quarter and its transformation into an Israeli police headquarters is just an example. Blood banks, Government medical laboratories, tuberculosis' sanatorium centres and the Department of Health have been closed down.

8. How should people under occupation react when doctors are arbitrarily imprisoned for no valid reason? I have already reported last week to the Council—as I always do, hoping against hope, that the Security Council will one day take effective measures and take the initiative of convening a meeting to bring peace to the land of peace—the arrest of Dr. Nabih Muammer, the only surgeon in Makasid Philanthropic Hospital, whose services are indispensable. Another doctor, Subhi Abu Ghosheh, has also been arbitrarily arrested.

9. What do you, all of my colleagues around this table, think in all honesty that these people under occupation should do, when day in and day out they hear about or witness more expulsions, and arrests and are subjected to oppressive and repressive measures? I have already cited the arrest of the Anglican Reverend Elia Khouri in Ramallah and the closing down of the Anglican Church there. People from all walks of life protested against this. Women in Jerusalem, Ramallah, Bethlehem and Beit Zahur took refuge in their churches and protested against such measures. That also was reported to the Security Council. Hunger strikes have taken place in churches and mosques in many other parts of the occupied territories. Christian and Moslem leaders, some of whom had been expelled from Jerusalem, sent a cable of protest to His Excellency U Thant, our dedicated Secretary-General [S/9102, annex I].

10. What should the reaction of the people be when they see their leaders being arrested and expelled? I have already reported to the Council the cases of Anton Attallah, our former Foreign Minister, Mr. Rouhi El-Khatib, the Mayor of Jerusalem, who appeared before this Council to present the case of Jerusalem, Ibrahim Bakr, Kamal Nassar, Dr. Daoud El-Husseini, Kamal Dajjani and Dr. Yasir Amre. Those are some of the many names.

11. One should ponder the question, what are the justifications for killing and murdering, in a similar air-raid against Syria, six innocent children, together with many other people whose names are listed in a document submitted to the Security Council and mentioned by my

colleague from the Soviet Union and by the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia.

12. And above all, let us ask ourselves the question: What should the Security Council do when its decisions about dispatching a representative of the Secretary-General to visit the occupied territories, to meet the people and report on all charges brought before the Council by the delegation of Jordan and other delegations, are completely rejected by Israel? What should the Council do when its injunction concerning the annexation of Jerusalem is ignored by Israel? That annexation was declared illegal by the Council, but when the Council called on Israel to rescind all measures taken, that injunction was rejected by Israel. What should the Council do about its decisions which are flouted, ignored, defied and utterly violated?

13. Elementary rules of humanity require that those who speak about the reaction of the people should also be fair, if not to Jordan then to the effectiveness in the future of this august body. The above-mentioned four Conventions specifically demand that civilian populations should not be subjected to attack from the air, and that ill-treatment and reprisals be prohibited. Those points and many others are endorsed by the very jurisprudence of the Security Council, which Mr. Tekoah mentions only for the purpose of distorting and confusing the issues before the Council.

14. Much has been said about the reaction of the people in the occupied areas. I had a chance to explain that the Palestine resistance movement is no different from the movements of liberation in many parts of the world where there is occupation and oppression. It is the spontaneous expression of a people denied the most elementary human rights.

15. Mr. Tekoah referred yesterday to certain African and European newspapers for the purpose of undermining the resistance movement. He also referred to two conferences held in Europe that he claimed condemned the Palestinian resistance. Let me remind Mr. Tekoah that many conferences representing Governments and peoples and held in many capitals of the world have also supported the Palestinian resistance.

16. The conference of the representatives of freedom fighters in Africa, Latin America and Asia representing over fifty countries and a number of international organizations, held in Khartoum last February supported the heroic struggle and resistance of the Palestinians against occupation. The conference emphatically supported their legitimate rights in Palestine.

17. The Conference of African Ministers of Labour which met in Algiers this month, March 1969, called upon African workers to boycott Israeli goods as they are boycotting South African and Portuguese goods.

18. Yesterday Mr. Tekoah referred to a newspaper in Nairobi which deplored the Palestinian resistance. Let me remind Mr. Tekoah that the Nairobi Government—Kenya—at the last session of the General Assembly voted against Israeli violations of human rights in the occupied territories.

19. There is even more reason for the Council to accept the resistance as a movement for liberation because, today, the occupied Arab territories are subject to the same military martial law that the British Mandate applied in Palestine prior to 1948. Those same laws were termed by Dr. Dov Yusuf, former Israeli Minister of Justice, as "laws which no respected citizen should abide by". Those same laws were also deplored by the present Minister of Justice, Samson Shapiro, "as laws that do not exist in any civilized country; even Nazi Germany did not have such laws". Those laws which the Jewish lawyers in Palestine condemned on 7 February 1946, before the creation of Israel, and which the present Israeli Minister of Justice described as laws which even Nazi Germany did not apply, are today being applied in the occupied Arab territories. Does not this call for resistance? Is resistance to such laws, which they themselves said that no respected citizen should abide by, unlawful, and is it logical to term such resistance as terror? I would like the two delegations that volunteered to give this definition to ponder it, to compare their definition with that of the Minister of Justice of Israel, and then see which of the definitions should be endorsed by the Council.

20. Resistance to occupation, annexation, expulsion, deportation, settlements, intimidation, imprisonment and torture is legitimate. What should be condemned is the Israeli aggression that brought about this situation. What the Security Council and the whole world should condemn is occupation itself.

21. It is not true that European leaders who resisted occupation in their own countries are condoning Israeli occupation. I refuse to believe that. Let me cite a great leader of our time, General de Gaulle, who said in his Press Conference of 27 November 1967 that all the manifestation of an occupation could now be seen in the territories occupied by Israel after the June war, "occupation which never goes without oppression, repression and expulsions —as well as the usual resistance that Israel now in its turn qualifies as terrorism".

22. In the Second World War, when France was occupied by the Nazis and an armistice was signed, teachers, scholars, students and people from all walks of life left France to prepare for resistance. General de Gaulle left Bordeaux for England by a small plane in order to organize the French resistance. Winston Churchill called him the man who "carried with him in that small aeroplane the honour of France". Those leading figures saw that only resistance could restore France's freedom and sovereignty. And today France is leading the world as a great nation with great values.

23. Mr. Tekoah has often spoken of terror and sabotage against Israel committed by Arab commandos and has repeatedly referred to those freedom fighters as terrorists and saboteurs. Let me remind him that terror and killings have been a systematic policy adhered to by the Zionists in erecting the State of Israel. The Arab freedom fighters of today are the victims of Zionist terror and killings. They are those same people whom the Zionists have expelled from their homeland through the means of terror and killing. I. F. Stone, a writer and scholar of the Jewish faith, an American who at one time was a member of one of the

Zionist terrorist organizations, when he was a Zionist himself, now has the publication *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, which is well known here. In an article he wrote on 13 January 1969 on this very question of resistance, he said:

"One [*unpleasant truth*] is to recognize that the Arab guerrillas are doing to us what our terrorists and saboteurs of the Irgun, Stern and Haganah did to the British. Another is to be willing to admit that their motives are as honourable as were ours."

Mr. Stone adds:

"The best of Arab youth feels the same way. They cannot forget the atrocities committed by us against villages like Deir Yassin, nor the uprooting of the Palestinian Arabs from their ancient homeland, for which they feel the same deep ties of sentiment as do so many Jews, however assimilated elsewhere."

He then continues:

"We made the Palestinian Arabs homeless to make a home for our own people. That is the simple truth as history will see it, and until we make amends and resettle the refugees and create a new political framework in which Jew and Arab can live together in a new and greater Palestine there will be no peace."

24. Uri Avnery, a one time member of the Irgun gang and at present a member of the Israeli *Knesset*, wrote in his book *Israel without Zionism*:

"We distributed leaflets describing the glorious deeds of our older comrades who had planted a bomb in a crowded Arab market . . ."

I repeat, "who had planted a bomb in a crowded Arab market". He continued:

"We demonstrated against the British by burning government offices when the British published in May 1939 the White Paper that put an end to Jewish immigration."

25. Terrorism is not and has never been part of our traditions or values. It was imported by the terrorist gangs of Israel.

26. My Government would like to emphasize once again that it would like to help all United Nations peaceful efforts. We also welcome the meeting of the four permanent members of the Security Council. But we do hope that the Israeli attempts to frustrate their efforts will not be permitted to succeed. We all remember that the Israeli criminal attack against Jordan was preceded by a campaign of vicious propaganda against the Council intended to frustrate its efforts. It follows, therefore, that lack of effective action by the Council will lead to the very result Israel sought to accomplish.

27. We maintain that by not taking a firm stand the Security Council would not help the efforts of its four permanent members, and this alone would weaken both

those efforts and this organ of the United Nations itself. There has been too much delay since the French initiative was taken, motivated by a noble goal.

28. The fact that there will be a meeting of the Big Four makes it imperative that the Council should check the unabated Israeli attacks. That will prepare the ground for fruitful and peaceful results. We do not expect the Big Four to have one meeting and settle the problem, nor two meetings. We know that those meetings will take quite some time. Unless, right here and now, we check future aggressions of Israel, Israel will be encouraged, while the meetings are going on, to attack Jordan every time Israel feels that that will suit its purpose.

29. My Government has instructed me to put the following before the members of the Security Council.

30. First, there is no justification for equating the individual acts of national resistance within the Arab-occupied territories with a well-planned, premeditated, indiscriminate and large-scale air attack.

31. Secondly, the Israeli attack aimed at centres of civilians and farmers, some of whom came from the West Bank, and Israel arrogantly confessed having committed that crime.

32. Thirdly, any hesitation on the part of the Security Council in taking effective measures, or any under-estimation of the grave and serious situation that has resulted from this Israeli attack, can only have the following effects: (a) deterioration of the situation and obstruction of the possibilities of peace in the area; (b) weaken the possibilities of progress in the efforts of the Big Four; (c) encourage Israel to carry out further attack and on a large scale; (d) loss of faith by peoples and Governments in the effectiveness of this body.

33. Let me reiterate that the victim, Jordan, cannot be equated with the aggressor, Israel, and that a resolution reflecting this reality of the situation is what we hope will be adopted by the Security Council.

34. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): During the many meetings held by the Security Council in 1968 to consider the situation in the Middle East and, in particular, serious and repeated violations of the cease-fire, with the resulting deaths, destruction and huge material losses, my delegation has repeatedly stated its views with frankness and sincerity. Those views have always been stated in unequivocal and consistent terms because the concept on which they are based is always the same and consistent.

35. Now that the Council is dealing with new and very serious developments of identical nature with some of the events of last year, it would suffice if I were to quote my own past statements to establish my delegations's position. However, I am convinced that a mere reference to those statements, even if succinct, would not be sufficient and that, on the contrary, it is necessary to state our views again.

36. We deeply regret the loss of lives, whether Arab or Israel, and our feeling of grief is great and sincere. We are distressed at the material losses, all the more because the sufferer, Jordan, is a developing country which for that very reason has an essentially weak economic infrastructure. The losses of life cannot be made good, and the material damage can only be repaired by great additional sacrifices imposed on a population which by its nature has already endured great hardship from problems of under-development aggravated by those due to a recent war.

37. We have never been, nor are we now, prepared to condone the violent incidents and other serious violations of the cease-fire, and we do not believe that the members of the Council or the Council as a whole are prepared to do so. We do not accept the doctrine of the right of reprisal whereby a State can presumably arrogate to itself the right to carry out military operations of the kind now being considered by the Council in the territory of the other State. We deplore all those incidents, but at the same time we distinguish between the two types of action because their nature is essentially different. This consistent and unchanging principle has led us to vote in favour of all the resolutions relating to the Middle East adopted by the Council during 1968, the first year in which we took part in its deliberations.

38. The harsh truth is that, as a result of those violent incidents and reprisals, the first and most numerous victims are members of the innocent civilian population.

39. The history of the Middle East, particularly during the last few decades, presents a tragic spectacle of untold war, death and desolation. And we wonder whether the time has not come for an end to be put to those sufferings, or at least a glimpse for hope of better days to come.

40. Deeply distressed by this heart-breaking spectacle of the very recent past and of a present dark with ill-omen, we believe that it is more urgent than ever to take concerted individual and collective action to prevent the deterioration in the present situation from leading to another explosion the violence of which may involve not only the States in the Middle East but also many others in a disastrous conflagration.

41. With this concern foremost in our minds we are following closely all the promising and unhelpful events that are occurring in the Middle East. Among the latter—the really and truly unhelpful—are those which are the cause for this meeting. Their unhelpfulness has been even further aggravated by their timing. The parties to the conflict and the United Nations itself have at their disposal a basic instrument through which a just and lasting peace can be achieved. I am, of course, referring to resolution 242 (1967), which was unanimously adopted by the Council on 22 November 1967 and whose provisions and principles provide the essential elements of the much-desired peace. The United Nations and the parties also have the means to implement the resolution by putting their trust in the tenacity, perseverance and ability of the Secretary-General and of his Special Representative Mr. Jarring. I need not repeat our views on resolution 242 (1967), which is based on the draft resolution which

we, with the other States of Latin America, had the honour to submit to the General Assembly at its fifth special emergency session and which represents the tradition, spirit and philosophy of our continent.

42. I have said that the unhelpfulness of the events that led to our meeting today was unavoidably aggravated by their timing. We are all aware of the contacts now taking place between the four permanent members of the Security Council to intensify the quest for a just and lasting peace based on resolution 242 (1967). We know that this quest is being carried out within our Organization and that its aim is to strengthen any action taken through the machinery set up and the resolutions adopted by the Council.

43. The structure of the Security Council, laid down in the Charter, confers special rights on its permanent members but also assigns special duties to them. It is therefore right that they should assume those special duties without further delay. The barriers preventing such contacts have existed too long, but we note with satisfaction that they are breaking down. Furthermore, we would be sinning by too much innocence if we ignored the influence that these permanent members can bring to bear on the parties to the conflict.

44. All those efforts, including and supported by our own, would however not suffice. All our goodwill would not be sufficient. The full co-operation of the parties themselves is required, and the best co-operation consists in strict compliance with the cease-fire. I have often said that the situation resulting from compliance with the cease-fire must be regarded as purely temporary by its very nature, until a lasting, and just and final peace replaces it. At least, however, the right atmosphere must be created so that the quest for that peace, the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, and the contacts between the four permanent members of the Security Council can achieve the results which we anxiously await.

45. My delegation therefore does not hesitate to make a new and brotherly appeal for wisdom and caution in the hope that it may result in strict compliance with the cease-fire, for the benefit of the peoples directly concerned and of the international community, which is greatly troubled by the present situation in the Middle East.

46. The PRESIDENT: I recognize Mr. Liu Chieh.

47. Mr. LIU (China): I have to remind the President again that I am speaking in my capacity as a representative on the Council.

48. We are called upon once again to deal with the situation in the Middle East, with special reference to the charge by Jordan that on 26 March Israeli aircraft attacked Jordanian villages and civilian centres in the areas of Es Salt, resulting in heavy casualties and considerable damage to property.

49. The substance of the charge has not been denied by Israel. There is only the contention that the targets of the attack were centres of armed elements hostile to Israel. Whatever the case may be, my delegation takes a serious

view of the incident. This kind of air raid across national boundaries cannot but be viewed as clear violation of the cease-fire and, as such, stands to be condemned by the Council. The use of force is prohibited under the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

50. The Permanent Representative of Israel, in his statement before the Council on 27 March [*1467th meeting*], described this action taken by Israel as an act of self-defence. My delegation has no quarrel with the right of self-defence, a right recognized by Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. In the present case, however, it is not so much self-defence as punitive action. Israel seems to believe in the effectiveness of armed action as a means of redress. If it does, it apparently has not attached sufficient importance to the urgency and desirability of pursuing conciliatory policies. To force the pace of achieving peace through the application of superior force would prove not only to be futile, but could destroy whatever headway might have been made towards peace and could jeopardize the prospect for a just and lasting settlement.

51. In saying this, my delegation is not unaware of the fact that acts of violence and counter-violence have become a daily routine, and frequent exchanges of fire continue unabated across the cease-fire line, especially in the Suez area. The consequence is misery and death for the very people in whose name these warlike acts are perpetrated. Whatever the motivation or rationalization may be, and whenever and wherever they occur, all forms of violence are to be deplored. It is high time to realize that it is only through peaceful means that the cause of justice can be served enduringly and the ultimate goals of the people of the region attained.

52. The basis for a just and lasting settlement has already been provided by Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The Secretary-General's Special Representative is currently in the Middle East to explore further the possibilities for such settlement. The peace efforts initiated by the interested Powers have barely started. This is no time to rock the boat. My delegation, therefore, earnestly appeals to all parties to give Ambassador Jarring every assistance in the search for peace, which can only be brought about with the co-operation and by the common consent of all the States in the Middle East area.

53. The PRESIDENT: There are no more names of speakers inscribed on my list for this morning.

54. I give the floor to the representative of Israel.

55. Mr. TEKOAH (Israel): No rancour and no passion and no abuse can veil reality. The facts are known to all. The Arab States, repulsed in their attempt to destroy Israel in 1967, have resorted again to the old method of terror warfare, and this was in accordance with the decision adopted by the Heads of Arab States at the Khartoum Conference in September 1967. It was reaffirmed at the Arab Conference of Foreign Ministers held in Cairo in September of last year, and since proclaimed repeatedly by Arab leaders.

56. The Arab States try in vain here to find pretexts and justification for this warfare. They call it a popular war; but

it is in fact carried out by about 4,000 marauders, organized, armed, trained and paid by the Arab Governments, operating from outside territory under Israeli control. They call it resistance to the consequences of the 1967 hostilities. In fact, it is the same method of warfare against civilians which the Arab States had pursued in the fifties and the sixties, long before June 1967. They call it a war of liberation; but the world knows and has not forgotten that the same description was given by the Arab States to their invasion of Israel in 1948 and to the acts of belligerency which they conducted against Israel during the entire period of the Armistice. Nothing has changed since 1948 except that the Arab States have failed again in their sinister design to destroy Israel, but have apparently not realized that the time has come for peace.

57. What is it precisely that Jordan expects us to do? Allow it to continue its twenty-one years' war against Israel without defending ourselves? Sit back while terror warfare is pursued from Jordanian territory? Acquiesce in the wanton murder of Israeli citizens? The world does not expect us to act in this manner. It is time that Jordan should not. Let us all remember the ancient proverb: "He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it."

58. The representative of Jordan has tried again to shed responsibility for terror warfare. He and his Government would obviously try to do that in a debate in the Security Council.

59. In previous meetings, however, I have established Jordan's juridical and practical responsibility for this warfare. It is only in the Security Council that Jordan negates this responsibility. In the Middle East, Jordan prides itself on it.

60. In an interview to *Al-Ahram*, published just a few days ago, on 18 March 1969, King Hussein said: "After 1967, we actually started *fedayeen* operations. We opened the gates for operation and resistance to the occupation started in the occupied territories."

61. Jordan's new Prime Minister Rifai, in a telephone interview with *Al-Jarida* of Lebanon on 25 March 1969, stated: "We shall continue with the resigned Government's policy to support the *fedayeen*."

62. In a note to King Hussein, Prime Minister Rifai stated on 24 March 1969: "With full admiration and appreciation we remember the wonderful co-ordination between our armed forces and the Arab forces and our beloved resistance fighters."

63. There can be no doubt whatever about the direct involvement and, therefore, responsibility of the Jordanian Government for terror warfare waged against Israel from Jordanian territory.

64. The representative of Jordan persists in his denials that Ein Hazar served as an El-Fatah base. However, as I demonstrated yesterday, this fact is generally known and has been widely reported in the world press by foreign correspondents who visited the area before the Israeli action on 26 March. The attempt by the Jordanian

authorities to conceal this fact after 26 March is not unusual in the light of past Jordanian behaviour; nor is it difficult. The Ein Hazar camp consisted, as I reported at our first meeting on 27 March, of a few buildings for commandos and storage depots, a canteen or two, and tents for the rank-and-file members of El-Fatah. At that meeting I also described the roadblock at Ein Hazar manned by the marauders, at which travellers from the West Bank are stopped, checked and interrogated. The four truck drivers killed on 26 March were unfortunately victims of that roadblock.

65. The representative of Jordan has referred to a report of the death of a saboteur in prison. The medical examination has refuted the allegations he has voiced here. Since June 1967 this is the only case in which death of an Arab terrorist has occurred in an Israeli prison. I would suggest to Ambassador El-Farra that he examine the records of Jordanian prisons and other Arab prisons, the records of tortures, mental and physical cruelty and deaths that occur in them repeatedly. I would suggest to him that he examine the records of the deaths of Jews killed since June 1967 in Egyptian concentration camps, Jews barbarically hanged in Baghdad, Jews tortured in Damascus.

66. The representative of Jordan is also unhappy with a number of demonstrations that have occurred in areas under Israeli control. Are demonstrations unusual in the Middle East? Has he forgotten the record of riots and unrest in areas under Jordanian administration and occupation? Let us look at just one single year—the year preceding the June 1967 hostilities. In January 1966, following demonstrations and riots in Jericho, the Jordanian authorities arrested 200 persons there. In April, following widespread unrest on the West Bank, they arrested 2,000 persons on the West Bank. In May, mass demonstrations took place in East Jerusalem, Hebron, Ramallah. The police used force, closed down schools, arrested hundreds of persons. In July of that year, disturbances and mass demonstrations broke out in Nablus. The Jordanian police used tear gas; twelve persons were wounded, 250 arrested. November saw a series of stormy disturbances and clashes between civilians and Jordanian police and army forces, with numerous casualties. On 21 November, shop and business strikes broke out in the Ramallah area. The army was called in to intervene and employed tanks. The Jordanian authorities imposed a curfew and closed down all the schools. Similar events occurred through November and December in most other towns. On 24 November the Jordanian army again employed tanks and tear gas. Twenty demonstrators were killed, Ambassador El-Farra, by Jordanian army forces and many more were wounded. On 8 December 1966, a general business strike was put down by force by the police and the Jordanian army. On 13 January 1967 the population of Nablus rose up; barricades were put up in the streets. The Jordanian army had to surround the entire city and suppress resistance by force.

67. In the *Al-Muharrir* of Beirut of 5 July 1966, we read:

"According to one reliable source, the number of persons arrested in Jordan from the last week in June till now comes to 500 . . . The arrests were made in Nablus,

Amman, the Old City of Jerusalem, Ramallah, Hebron, Irbid, Jericho, Jerash . . . (There follows a long list of names of persons who were arrested.)

“Also arrested was Kamel Nef’a, lecturer in philosophy and sociology at the University of Jordan. He was severely tortured”—I am reading from a Lebanese newspaper—“and finally transferred to the Falastin Hospital in Amman. All the teachers of the Jebel el-Husseini refugee camp school were placed under arrest, as were several of the students. Similar round-ups were carried out at the Jericho and El-Arub camps and in the town of Ma’an.”

68. The Jordan representative has mentioned a number of persons arrested by Israel for acts of violence against civilians. He has not mentioned, however, that most of these people are professional troublemakers and that some of them had been arrested by the Jordanians for the same crimes. Daud el-Husseini, mentioned by Ambassador El-Farra, was arrested by the Jordanian authorities on 23 April 1969, together with another 120 politicians.

69. According to the Lebanese newspaper *Al-Muharir* of 10 May 1966:

“The number of persons arrested by the Jordanian Government has reached several dozens, and they include Ayub Abibi and Dr. Subhi Goshah”—mentioned again by Ambassador El-Farra today.

70. According to Radio Baghdad on 27 October 1963: “. . . two days ago at midnight, Dr. Khaled el-Darzi was arrested at his work at Nablus hospital.”

71. A well-known Arab authority, Professor Walid Al-Khalidi writes:

“. . . the West Bank has become a Jordanian colony occupied by the ‘Forces of the Desert and mercenaries’, where the Palestinians are prohibited from organizing themselves; the Gaza Strip is administered as occupied territory by an Arab Government . . .”

72. The Jordanian representative, in referring to old British mandatory laws applied by Israel, has forgotten to mention, as he frequently does, the decisive fact in this picture—these laws are also Jordanian laws applicable on the West Bank, applied by Israel in accordance with generally accepted principles of international law.

73. Indeed, I have no hesitation in saying that when the citizens of Arab States—Jews, and non-Jews alike—begin to enjoy even partially the freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly and freedom of movement and the personal security enjoyed by the Arab inhabitants in areas under Israeli control, the Arab States will have made considerable progress towards democracy.

74. The representative of Jordan pleads for another one-sided, inequitable resolution. Yesterday he recited an entire list of such resolutions. Have those decisions made any constructive contribution to a solution of the Middle East problem? Can one-sided resolutions make any such contribution?

75. All are aware of the history of the Security Council deliberations on the Israel-Arab conflict; all know that the veto has prevented any constructive handling of this issue since 1953: All know that the present composition of the Council is such that, no matter how extreme and unjust a text may be, it is always assured of the automatic support of a majority of members.

76. Under these circumstances, a resolution of the kind that is sought by Jordan and its supporters can have only one effect on the situation: to increase tension and decrease the prospects of understanding and peace. Only understanding between the parties themselves can bring about such a solution. If Jordan is really desirous of achieving it, Jordan will seek such understanding with Israel, and not an addition to the list of unbalanced, unconstructive texts.

77. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Jordan.

78. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): It so happens that whenever I want to answer Mr. Tekoah I find myself at the disadvantage of racing with time. I realize that it is almost 1.45 p.m.; I feel I would be imposing on the Council if I were to take the time to answer every single point raised by Mr. Tekoah this afternoon. I shall therefore confine my observations to two or three points, reserving my right to speak again at a later stage.

79. Let us start with the last point raised by Mr. Tekoah, the question of the resolutions. Mr. Tekoah said that a resolution is not binding on Israel simply because, I think, it does not meet the desires of Israel.

80. It is not a question of Jordan’s friends, because the resolutions which condemned Israel on the question of Jerusalem were endorsed and supported by ninety-nine votes in the Assembly, and by thirteen votes in the Security Council. Not a single delegation—be it a friend of Israel or not—voted against those resolutions, which called the Israeli annexation of Jerusalem invalid.

81. But Israel would like the Security Council to behave in accordance with Israeli goals. When the Council took a decision last December, what was the reaction? Mrs. Meir, who is now the Israeli Prime Minister, said: “I am beginning to feel very sorry for this family of nations that sits there and discusses our actions. It would be more justified if the Knesset were to debate the United Nations and the Security Council.” Israel would like the Knesset to be the supreme organ of the world, telling the Security Council what and what not to do. The present Prime Minister of Israel says that “it would be much more justified if the Knesset”—the Israeli parliament—“were to debate the United Nations and the Security Council”. That statement appeared in the *Jerusalem Post* of 6 January 1969, the semi-official newspaper of Israel.

82. Mr. Allon, the Israeli Deputy Prime Minister—number two in rank—said: “The United Nations Security Council has turned into an insecurity council, encouraging terrorist activity.” That is the Deputy Prime Minister speaking.

83. I could go on and cite General Dayan, who said almost the same thing. So it is not a question of the so-called

inequitable distribution in the Council. The Council is constituted pursuant to the Charter, in a fair and just way. But it is the Israelis' lust, their cupidity and their desire to have more and more and more, every day and every week, if they can, which is involved here.

84. Mr. Tekoah referred to what is going on in the East Bank but forgot one thing: What goes on in the East Bank is a matter of domestic jurisdiction. The question is: What are the Israelis doing in the West Bank? Why are they there? Why are they occupying the West Bank? Is not their continued presence in the West Bank—on the territory of Jordan—a continued act of aggression, condemned by the jurisprudence of the United Nations? That is the question.

85. But when they expel people—and there are 460,000 people who have been expelled by Israel to the East Bank of the Jordan after the six-day war—they should not expect those people to send them a “thank-you note.” If they expect that they are mistaken; if they expect the people expelled not to go back and fight they are mistaken. Those people are citizens of Jordan, whether they are on the West Bank or the East Bank. They belong to one territory, recognized by the United Nations, a State Member of the United Nations having the assurances of all its friends that its territorial integrity will be protected. So what are the Israelis doing in the West Bank, and in Sinai, for that matter, and in the Gaza Strip, and in the Golan Heights? That is the question.

86. I shall take only two minutes more. Mr. Tekoah said that Arab terrorists operate from outside the occupied territories. That is not true. Resistance is from within. But we do know that the Israeli behaviour in the West Bank gives every proof that they are after the annexation of that part of Jordanian territory. I do not have to go far to get you the evidence. Here is General Dayan, the hero of Israel. This is what he is saying to get more popularity—it is something which reflects the thinking of Zionism. He said: “I see the Jordan River as our frontier”—the Jordan River, the frontier of future Israel—“and the mountain range west of the River”—the area which is now being shelled but is not occupied yet, the heights between Syria and the northern part of the East Bank of Jordan—“as bases to protect our frontier”.

87. That is the hero of Israel speaking. He started this whole war, and here he tells you what he wants. Allon wanted to have part of the occupied territory as security; then Dayan wanted more, to secure the security—to have more area to secure the other occupied area.

88. This has no limit. So the question which the Council should turn to and discuss at this time is: Why, after twenty-two months, are the Israelis still there? I think withdrawal is the answer; and as long as there is no withdrawal there will be resistance. I have no apology to make to Mr. Tekoah; there will be resistance because this is the spirit of the day, the spirit of liberation and human rights. When people are oppressed they will resist, until they get rid of the conquerors. And the Israelis are the conquerors.

89. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

90. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I would have elected not to speak at this late hour, the more so because it is past lunch time. However, I should remind the members of the Council that this meeting was scheduled for 11 o'clock this morning. In the last few years it was a habit to hold consultations not at night, not in the early hours of the morning, but immediately before the time that a meeting had been scheduled. This was so for many years. Those of us who are not consulted come here on time. In fact, this is not an apology, but a few remarks so that those of us who are prompt may be given a chance to participate without trying to interfere in the time-table of others, whether for meals or any other duties or obligations they may have.

91. I cannot remain silent after having heard Mr. Tekoah cite such proverbs as “He that diggeth a pit falls into it”. I think he should have quoted the proverb correctly because it is an old Semitic one: “He that diggeth a pit for his brother falls into it”. I should like to remind him of a proverb that says: “He who takes by the sword is taken by the sword”. Both acts, digging a ditch and taking by the sword are deplorable in the era of the United Nations. But the facts of life confront us and we have no choice but to deal with the tragedies and tribulations of people regardless of their race, sex or religion.

92. Mr. Tekoah said that the Arab States had ganged up, so to speak, to destroy Israel in 1948. The Arab States did not desire to destroy anyone in Palestine. It was an alien people, who happened to be Jews, that hailed from Eastern and Central Europe, using Judaism as a motivation for political and economic ends, that came into Palestine, and there was resistance.

93. The Mandatory Power of the United Kingdom failed in trying to bring peace in the Holy Land right from the time it was declared the Mandatory Power at the time of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 up to 1939 a period of twenty years noted for massacres between the Arabs and the Jews. The British themselves had their share of sorrow as many of their troops, who were supposed to be there to maintain peace, were killed and insulted and spat upon.

94. Those alien people from Eastern and Central Europe who happened to be Jews—but more so, I would say, who happened to be Zionists—are at the root of all these tragedies. They talk of atrocities and say that the Arabs are aping the Nazis, having forgotten that even in Lidice, in Czechoslovakia, the Nazis spared the old men and women and children when they retaliated because the valiant Czech people in that small town tried to fight to liberate themselves from the Nazis. When I addressed myself to this question in one of the organs of the United Nations years ago, I checked with none other than my Czech colleague. He told me that the Nazis did not kill the boys and that no man over fifty, if my memory serves me correctly, and no women were touched. Those were the Nazis.

95. What did the Zionists do? Deir Yassin was wiped off the map of Palestine and every creature—not only human beings—was killed and murdered at dawn, surrounded by machine-guns. By whom? By the gangs to which my Jordanian colleague referred. You talk, Mr. Tekoah, of digging ditches. That was the cause of the panic of the Arab

people of Palestine—the indigenous people—forget that they are Arabs! They got so frightened that they left for Jordan and they became refugees.

96. You talk of Jordanian atrocities, Egyptian atrocities, Syrian atrocities. They are all deplorable. I think you should bear that in mind, Mr. Tekoah, not to mention atrocities by others when it was you who started them when the land of Palestine was the Land of Peace, before the European Zionists usurped it. There were practically no crimes in the Holy Land during the time of the Ottomans. There were perhaps personal crimes such as happen everywhere, but there were indeed very few crimes. The Arabs did not desire to destroy anyone in Palestine. It was those alien Eastern European Zionists who started this whole tragedy. How true it is, unfortunately, that those who take by the sword are taken by the sword, inasmuch as we are here to prevent such tragedies.

97. And who is it that is equating Jordan with Israel here in acts of aggression, but the representative of a Power that has upheld Israel ever since its inception? Why? It is understandable; it is because that Power, that State which is supporting Israeli aggression, is to a large extent under the influence of the Zionists, who have wormed themselves into the Government of that State and to a large extent control its media of information and can tip the balance in the economic and social fields inside that country—and, I dare say, in many other Western countries as well.

98. And why does Israel begin such action on the very eve of the day when the major Powers are trying to meet in the hope of finding some solution? It is to sow dissent among the four major Powers, and—let me be frank—especially between the United States, on the one hand, and France and the Soviet Union on the other, whether jointly or separately, just because the Chiefs of State and the Governments of France and the Soviet Union do not allow the Zionists to sway their policies. The Zionists think they should be subject to the policies of Zionism. The Zionists think that they should come and tell the United States, “You are right in your support of Israel”—leave aside this “even-handedness”—“and, by consensus, let us sell the Palestinians down the river”—the Palestinian people who have never been mentioned in this Council except during the last three or four years, even then only haphazardly, as an entity, as a people that has a personality and that should have been liberated a long time ago, after the British relinquished the responsibility of their Mandate in Palestine.

99. My brother from Jordan mentioned this morning how certain Powers—he did not name them; I suppose he is more polite than I am, he uses the diplomatic modalities—how certain Powers are trying to equate Jordan with Israel in the latest act of aggression. May I remind my good friend the Ambassador of the United States, none other than Mr. Yost, why the United States is involved in a war in the Far East. Why? Because, we have been told time and again, the United States thought that the Geneva Agreement was infringed upon by one of the parties to that Agreement. Which is more important, and should there not be an equation, even if one dispute is not more important than the other—should there not be an equation made with

regard to the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations and involving the duties and obligations of not only the four major Powers but also of the parties to the dispute in Palestine? It so happens that Israel has flouted all the resolutions that were adopted. Israel has gone beyond the partition lines of 1947; it has flouted the right of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homeland, as has been brought out by my colleague from Jordan. The actions that Israel has taken, even through its legislative body, with regard to Jerusalem should be considered as null and void; they were considered as invalid by this Council. Why do the big Powers not equate Israel's violation of all these resolutions with the alleged infringement of an agreement by one party in the Far East? There are 450,000 or more troops, alien to Asia, in the Far East because one of the countries thought that the Geneva Agreement was infringed upon or violated; but here, in this case, a certain country, none other than Israel, has systematically infringed upon and violated an agreement among five, six or seven States—I do not remember exactly how many. The States appended their signatures to the Geneva Agreement in 1954, but when that Agreement was allegedly violated by one of the parties, there was a big war, one which could involve us all one day in a holocaust if it is not stopped.

100. But the Council pronounces itself and the General Assembly of the United Nations pronounces itself on the partition of Palestine, in resolutions that need no interpretation because they are clear—partition anyway, was illegal—but never mind the illegality of the partition—and on the fact that Israel has gone beyond the partition line and has refused to have the refugees go back to their homeland. I shall not give a list of all those resolutions; but what about the resolution on Jerusalem? Why does not one of those major Powers send a warning, like the warning sent to one of the parties in the Far East, “If you do not obey, there will be war”. Of course it is not a declared war, but in essence there is war. Why do not the big Powers equate us—because we are Asians.

101. Where is Lord Caradon today? In Anguilla. The United Kingdom sent a police force; it sent a part of the navy to that tiny island of Anguilla. Why does not the United Kingdom, along with its allies, send a police force or an army to the shores of Palestine? We do not expect them to; we do not want them to. But why is there this double standard? To Anguilla they send a force; with respect to Palestine, it has been a tennis ball between the big Powers and other Powers for them to play with throughout all these years. At the expense of whom? Of the indigenous people of Palestine and the poor innocent people too who are being killed in Israel, the Jews. Do not think we are so inhuman as not to value human life as such, even of the Jews.

102. If the big Powers meant business they indeed would have acted with dispatch to see that justice was done, justice that is enunciated in the Charter.

103. Someone has just reminded me that the United States is not even a signatory to the Geneva Agreements. But the United States has a moral responsibility like the Soviet Union, like France, like the United Kingdom, to see to it that Israel obeys the United Nations resolutions. I am

not talking about the foolish resolutions condemning one side or the other or criticizing one side or the other. They are not worth the paper and the ink, because if the major resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly are not heeded by Israel, what are you doing here, gentlemen? Are you dealing in platitudes, semantics and rhetoric? Of course you are all under instructions, but I hope that what I say will carry through to your Governments. Indeed injustice is being perpetrated and strife is continuing, and tragedy has become the order of the day, whether it is inside Jordan or Egypt or Syria or so-called Israel itself.

104. I say "so-called Israel" because I should like this Council to know that not all the Americans here in this country are on the side of Zionism. I shall quote from the declaration of a Jewish organization that numbers thousands upon thousands, but they are not as articulate as the Zionists. They say that those Americans of the Jewish faith want full and equal national rights not only in the United States:

"Zionism is a philosophy of despair. It states that all Jews share a common nationality linked to Israel. It works for the in-gathering of the Jews in Palestine . . ."

Is there any wonder that the Arabs are fearful and that many of them are in panic? —

" . . . and produces the self-segregation of Jews from fellow Americans. Zionism seeks to invest every Jew with a nationalistic relationship to all other Jews and with a Zionist national commitment to Israel. Judaism is a religion, not a nationality. We are not anti-Zionist." —These are Jews who are talking.—"We urge Americans of all faiths to reject the Zionist concept that the State of Israel is a fulfilment of the Biblical prophecy of the homeland of the American Jew."

105. The famous correspondent Bob Considine, who paid many visits to Israel, was asked time and again, "Why do the Americans hesitate to come to Israel?" Mr. Ben Gurion posed that question. Bob Considine wrote: "Why do they hesitate?", David Ben Gurion once asked me. 'Can't they understand that we need their skills, we need doctors, engineers, scientists, teachers and farmers desperately?'" I am quoting from Bob Considine. "The old man . . ." —meaning Ben Gurion; I would have said "the venerable man", but this is the American way of saying "the old man"; they call their father "the old man"—". . . did not like my answer, 'I guess they feel they have already found the promised land.'" —meaning here in America.

106. Mr. Tekoah wants all the Jews to go to his promised land, Palestine, and that is at the root of all the trouble. Do not equate Jordan with the acts perpetrated by your people, Mr. Tekoah—not the Jews from my part of the world. They are my people. You talk about your people and I talk about my people. The oriental Jews are my people. They spoke Arabic, they ate Arabic food, their customs were Arabic, they were with me at school, we never had any barriers on account of their being Jews. Do not confuse the issue and never say "my people", because they are not your people. Your people are those of Central

Europe and of Eastern Europe, if they so desire. Do not confuse the issue before the Security Council, because I shall bring more arguments from your own Zionist scholars to show that you are using this for propaganda purposes and to play on the sentiments of American Jews who are loyal citizens of the United States. But the media of information, which you control, try to brainwash them and to play on their sentiments, which is quite natural.

107. Mr. Tekoah talks of freedom of thought. He talks of free association. He talks about the Arabs inside that State as enjoying freedom and democracy which he alleges are wanting in Arab countries. We do not want the Periclean type of democracy, with all due respect to the Greeks.

108. If Pericles' bones have not crumbled because of the passage of centuries, they must stir in his tomb when some of you around here begin to talk about democracy as if it were a monopoly of Western countries. Democracy has existed in Asia, without the name; it has been in the institutions of Asia, in the tribal systems of Asia, where kings and chiefs of tribes are subject to the law and are not immune. What are you talking about when you speak of democracy? A perverted democracy in whose name many crimes have been committed. Once Thomas Paine said, in this country of the United States: "Oh liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name?" Democracy—with machines, ballots, trying to influence the subliminal minds of prospective voters, bribing them with tangibles and intangibles, the spoils system.

109. You can have your democracy! Leave our institutions intact and let us evolve them into something better! But do not try to use such fetish, such a stereotyped word as democracy. It is outmoded. The people in almost every country are being brainwashed by such slogans. But the youth has awakened. They do not believe that there is democracy in spirit, except perhaps in certain communities. In the modern world, in the name of democracy wars are being waged.

110. Somebody said something the other day about bigotry. I do not want to mention his name in order not to embarrass the representative of the host country. He is a legislator. He said: "Adam and Eve, if I had my choice, would have been born in the United States". The Americans have power now. They think that the whole civilization, the whole creation should begin here. I think that Eden was in Iraq, at one time Mesopotamia. Maybe, because now Iraq is Arab, it was a mistake to have Eden there; it should have been located in some country which can wield power. "Even-handed treatment". What even-handed treatment? What have we done to you? You went into our part of the world when we opened our doors for you to come and trade and prospect for natural resources. What have we done to you that from a distance of thousands of miles you want to shape our destiny? And here, because of the might of the big Powers, and the bounty which they can distribute to all, under all kinds of epithets—technical aid and I do not know what else, loans without interest, and so on—you can buy some of our politicians, but you cannot buy our people.

111. Leave us alone, for heaven's sake, to evolve our respective countries, in Asia and in Africa, in peace. Do not

be supercilious and self-righteous, as you were during colonial days. I wish the Zionists had a sort of classical colonialism in our part of the world. It would come to an end like all colonial systems are coming to an end. I am referring to this usurpation of a people, the Palestinian people, the usurpation of their homeland. They own 65 per cent of the orchards in Palestine, the citrus orchards. Israel is selling the citrus fruit for \$175 million or so a year. I do not know the exact figure, I may be mistaken. But it is millions of dollars worth of citrus fruit, gathered from the orchards of the indigenous people of Palestine for twenty years. It would not matter if it were even \$50 million or \$10 million. The Zionists do not allow the United Nations to appoint a custodian. Have you ever heard of any such tyranny?

112. You Western countries fought the Germans in two world wars. You never confiscated the private property of the Germans. Ah, you might say—Israel might say—“There were many Jews in Arab countries that had to flee for their lives”. The Zionists set themselves up as if they had a power of attorney from those Jews. They even exacted a power of attorney from those Jews to deduct from Arab accounts the value of such property. It is all confusion leading to tragedy.

113. I do not believe that anything will come out of it in my lifetime, unless, by a sort of change of heart, or miraculously, the European Zionists come to their senses and realize that there is no future for them in Palestine in the long run. They cannot pit themselves against a hundred million Arabs, leaving aside the indigenous people of Palestine. The door is open for them to come to their senses, and you gentlemen here, especially those who are responsible, may be able to persuade them that if they want to live in peace in the Middle East they could do so as human beings—they could be of the Jewish faith—but not as an exclusive society setting themselves up apart from the rest of the world, as if indeed they were the chosen people of God, taking the letter of certain passages in the Bible with a fundamentalistic interpretation.

114. They should know very well that King David said: “I look up to the hills.” And one of those hills is Mount Zion. It is a spiritual looking up to the hills, to the Invisible, to the Unknown, which, I must say in praise of Judaism, is God, the Invisible, the Ineffable. It is so in Islam’s Ninety-Nine Epithets describing God. No one can define Him. Those outside the pale of monotheistic religions also consider the creative force—the Brahmin, for instance, as

ineffable. And in the twentieth century the Zionists come and tell us that God gave the British—and Mr. Truman—a power of attorney to transfer Palestine to them and that Sion, from which Zionism is derived, is something terrestrial and that they should occupy it. This is the twentieth century; whom do they think they are fooling? They are not fooling themselves because they are secular—the leaders—with all due respect to those Jews who have religious sentiment. Wake up from that nightmare! It is our nightmare too. It will be a nightmare for everybody in the area. Face the facts! Be human! Do not set yourselves up as an exclusive people—with all due respect to your prophets, who are also our prophets. And then there will be peace in Palestine. The whole world is awakening to the fact that a world Jewish problem is being created; and I would hate to see Jews or any other minority become the scapegoat whenever trouble flares up and somebody wants to punish the innocent.

115. Saudi Arabia has never sought a seat on this Council or any other in the United Nations, and if we sometimes allow ourselves the liberty of being expansive about any subject it is because we feel that this item is very vital to us. And as a Member of the United Nations, signatory to the Charter, it is incumbent on us to make our views clear to every member of the Council and every Member of the United Nations, including Israel, so that there may be no misunderstanding in the future as to our stand.

116. Only recently his Majesty King Faisal, in a speech at el Hadj—the pilgrimage—declared that he and the Saudi Arabian people are prepared to make martyrs of themselves to retrieve Jerusalem. It is my duty to mention this in concluding my statement. And I hope, Mr. President, that you will give me the floor when any draft resolution is tabled.

117. The PRESIDENT: There are no more names on the list of speakers for this meeting.

118. I wish to inform the Council that great efforts are being made to accelerate consideration of the problem on the agenda of the Council today. For the proper assessment of the case, and in view of circumstances beyond the scope of the Council, I propose that we should meet this afternoon. On the basis of private consultations with members of the Council, it seems that for the majority of members it would be suitable to meet at 4.30 p.m.

The meeting rose at 2.35 p.m.

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre librairie ou adressez-vous à: Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Получите справки об изданиях в нашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
